

FARM BUREAU MEMBERSHIP

Member families by States as of November 30, 1967 (audited report for the end of the American Farm Bureau Federation's 1967 fiscal year).

<i>State</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Total</i>
Alabama -----	100,024	Nevada -----	1,630
Arizona -----	4,051	New Hampshire -----	3,487
Arkansas -----	54,024	New Jersey -----	3,199
California -----	60,380	New Mexico -----	9,557
Colorado -----	13,478	New York -----	14,591
Connecticut -----	2,492	North Carolina -----	59,814
Delaware -----	1,500	North Dakota -----	15,736
Florida -----	35,069	Ohio -----	50,875
Georgia -----	51,733	Oklahoma -----	52,785
Hawaii -----	875	Oregon -----	8,367
Idaho -----	11,406	Pennsylvania -----	12,624
Illinois -----	190,477	Puerto Rico -----	5,960
Indiana -----	153,162	Rhode Island -----	227
Iowa -----	110,019	South Carolina -----	28,760
Kansas -----	83,697	South Dakota -----	3,943
Kentucky -----	87,839	Tennessee -----	87,956
Louisiana -----	26,657	Texas -----	105,653
Maine -----	2,003	Utah -----	8,636
Maryland -----	9,412	Vermont -----	5,255
Massachusetts -----	4,052	Virginia -----	20,360
Michigan -----	52,144	Washington -----	4,064
Minnesota -----	29,407	West Virginia -----	4,088
Mississippi -----	66,462	Wisconsin -----	25,311
Missouri -----	41,365	Wyoming -----	7,928
Montana -----	4,486		
Nebraska -----	15,693	National total -----	¹ 1,753,532

¹ Farm Bureau memberships are reported by families. The number of individuals is not reported; however, if it is assumed that the average member family includes three persons 14 years of age and over, the total number of individuals would be in excess of 5,250,000.

Mr. SHUMAN. The second one was: Should spending be cut, Federal spending be cut, and how much? We definitely favor a very heavy cut in Federal spending, and we believe it can be made.

It is absolutely ridiculous to take the attitude that you cannot cut spending because Congress keeps adding to it. They can take it off the way they have been putting it on.

Some of the things that could be cut, we are ready, willing, and have suggested cuts in Federal farm program spending of \$1 billion or more. We believe that the poverty program, much of the poverty program, is money down the rathole. It has been wasted and squandered throughout the country, and it is not effective in the objectives which could be attained in different ways. Much of the poverty program expenses could be eliminated.

We think the foreign aid programs have had a lot of water in them, and a lot of waste, and that they can be cut down very drastically.

We agree with Mr. McDonald that the moonshot and some of these things could wait to a time when we were not in as drastic a situation as far as the fiscal survival of this Nation is concerned.

There is no question but what the rivers and harbors appropriations can be drastically cut. This is the pork barrel type of thing, a kind of make-work project for the Army Engineers, in which billions of dollars have been spent on these projects throughout the United States that ought to be curtailed, postponed, or eliminated.